

REMARKS

Claim 1 is cancelled by this amendment. New claim 12 has been added. Claims 2-12 will be pending after the entry of this amendment. Claims 2-5, 7, 9, and 10 have been amended. Claims 5 and 7 have been amended into independent claims. New claim 12 is based on claim 9 as filed but is made dependent on claim 7. The amendments are supported at least by the disclosures in the specification at page 6, line 5 to page 7, line 13; and page 12, lines 15-23. Applicants respectfully submit that no new matters have been introduced.

Claim Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112

The Office Action rejected claim 9 as being indefinite. Claim 9 has been amended to depend on claim 5 and the recitation “and/or slipperiness-improving layer” has been deleted. The amendments render claim 9 in full compliance with 35 U.S.C. §112. Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claim 9.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

I. The Office Action rejected claims 1-4, 6, and 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly obvious over U.S. Patent Nos. 5,798,172 (“Funaki”), 5,518,817 (“Yamasaki”), or 5,707,719 (“Yoshinaga”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,037,700 (“Davis”) or 4,529,772 (“Druschke”).

Claim 1 has been cancelled, rendering the rejection to this claim moot. The Office Action indicates that the subject matter of claims 5, 7 and 8 is allowable. Claims 5 and 7 have been amended to be independent claims including all the limitations of claim 1 and of the previously presented claim 5 and claim 7, respectively. Claims 2-4 and 9 have been amended to depend on claim 5 and/or claim 7. Thus, claims 2-4, 6 and 9 are now allowable. Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejections to claims 1-4, 6, and 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

II. Claims 1, 2, 10 and 11 were rejected as obvious over U.S. Patent No. 5,775,028 (“Okada”) in view of Funaki, Yamasaki or Yoshinaga. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections. Applicants note that Okada is actually U.S. Patent No. 5,777,028 instead of 5,775,028. The rest of the response assumes that the Examiner intended to rely on US 5,777,028

as the primary reference. If the assumption is incorrect, Applicants' request that the Examiner clarify which was the primary reference intended. Claim 1 has been cancelled. Claims 2, 10 and 11 have been made dependent directly or indirectly on the allowable claim 5 or 7. As a result, claims 2, 10 and 11 should be allowable also. Withdrawal of the obviousness rejections of claims 2, 10 and 11 is requested.

CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' representative to discuss any issue that would expedite allowance of the subject application.

In the event the filing of this paper is deemed not timely, Applicants petition for an appropriate extension of time. The Commissioner is authorized to charge the petition fee and/or any additional fees that may be required in connection with the filing of this paper or to credit any overpayment to Kenyon & Kenyon LLP's Deposit Account No. 11-0600.

Respectfully submitted,

KENYON & KENYON LLP

Dated: June 20, 2008

By: King L. Wong
King L. Wong
Reg. No. 37,500

1500 K Street, N.W., Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005-1257
(202) 220-4200 (telephone)
(202) 220-4201 (facsimile)